

Submitted: March 18, 2004

Approved:

**CITY OF ROCKVILLE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES**

Thursday, February 19, 2004

Meeting No. 3-2004

The City of Rockville Historic District Commission convened in regular session in the Mayor and Council Chambers, Rockville City Hall, 111 Maryland Avenue, at 7:15 PM.

Internet information: www.rockvillemd.gov/government/commissions/hdc/2003/hdcagenda.html

PRESENT

Anita Neal Powell, Chairperson

Craig Moloney

Andrea Hartranft

Jeff Broadhurst

Absent: Commissioner Max van Balgooy

Staff present: Cindy Kebba and Robin Ziek, Preservation Planners; Jim Wasilak, Chief of Long-Range Planning, Scott Parker, Planner III

I. COMMISSION ITEMS

- **Approval of Minutes:** Meeting No. 1-2004, January 15, 2004
Commissioner Broadhurst noted a typographical error in the motion at the bottom of page 9 (Commissioner van Broadhurst should read Commissioner Broadhurst).

MOTION: Commissioner Moloney moved, seconded by Commissioner Broadhurst, to approve the minutes of January 15, 2004 as corrected.

VOTE: 4-0

- **Approval of Minutes:** Meeting No. 2-2004, February 7, 2004 (Site visit – 17 Wood Lane)

MOTION: Commissioner Moloney moved, seconded by Commissioner Hartranft, to approve the minutes of February 7, 2004 as written.

VOTE: 4-0

II. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL [The order for consideration was shifted by the Chair to accommodate the large number of attendees for Item C.]

- C. HDC2003-00284**
- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| Applicant: | Reverend Jane Wood |
| Address: | Jerusalem Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church,
17-21 Wood Lane |
| Request: | Demolition of Cordelia House at 17 Wood Lane |

The record on this application was held open from the January 15, 2004 meeting.

Staff summarized the staff report. Planner Kebba stated that Jerusalem-Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church and its former parsonage are located within the West Montgomery Avenue local and National Register Historic Districts. The church was built c. 1858 (rebuilt 1892) and the parsonage was constructed in 1912. The parsonage is a rectangular frame and timber two-story vernacular structure with a slightly sloping shed roof. It was damaged by arson in February 1999. Since the fire, the building has been boarded up and repairs have not been made. The Applicant requests a Certificate of Approval to demolish Cordelia House, the former parsonage at 17 Wood Lane. Its most recent use was as a homeless women's resource center.

Staff stated that a historic area Certificate of Approval application (HDC00-0154) requesting demolition for the parsonage building was previously submitted in February 2000 and a public hearing was held in March 2000. The building had been damaged by fire a year previously. Rockville fire inspectors reported the damage as mostly cosmetic but the fire marshal determined that the building was not suitable for habitation in its damaged condition and withdrew its occupancy permit. The insurance company assessed it as a total loss, paid out some of the some insurance money, and is withholding the remainder (approximately \$22,000) until the building is demolished, restored, or rebuilt. The building has been boarded and unused since the fire.

Staff recommended denial of the application at the time because:

1. Demolition is to be a last resort
2. Efforts to reuse repair or find alternatives to demolition had either not been made or followed through.

Planner Kebba noted that, according to a member of the Board of Trustees in 2000, preliminary plans were underway to move the women's resource center to another location and do some work on the interior to prepare it for use for Sunday school classes and other programs before it was fire damaged. However, the estimated costs to repair the fire damage and make the interior improvements were considered to be excessive and the Church felt that its funds would be better used to demolish the building and the money put toward other improvements. At the March 2000 HDC meeting, future expansion goals of the Church were discussed, but these plans were described by Church representatives as very preliminary and funding sources had not yet been identified for an expansion.

It was mentioned that the City hired an independent structural engineer to assess the structural integrity of the building and provide a cost estimate for repairs. The parsonage building was inspected by Mohammad Vatan of MGV Consulting Structural Engineers, Inc. on May 2, 2000. The MGV inspection report indicated that the building was repairable and the cost would be roughly \$30,000 to \$40,000 to fix the structural damage.

According to the chronology compiled by staff, the application for demolition was continued until further notice at the request of the applicant at the May 16, 2000 HDC meeting. Since then, members of the Board of Trustees met with HDC and planning staff on several occasions to discuss the church's needs, rehabilitation of the former parsonage and future expansion plans. A grant of \$5,000 to reimburse the Church for stabilization of the building was approved by Preservation Maryland in 2002 as a first step toward its rehabilitation and reuse. Other grants had been verbally committed previously, but were "minimal amounts" according to Church representatives and required façade easements, which was not amenable to the Board of Trustees. In addition to seed money to help attract

other donors, Peerless Rockville offered assistance with fundraising, technical assistance, and help with grant applications.

A publicly advertised site visit to the building was held on February 7, 2004 and was attended by four members of the HDC, two members of HDC staff, Reverend Jane Wood and Jerusalem Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church Board of Trustees Chair Rosetta Jackson.

A letter was received from Karleton and Denise Jackson in favor of demolition and a telephone call was received by staff from John Berry, 40 Wood Lane, who stated that the building is an eyesore and he wanted to see something done with this property, whether it is rehabilitation and reuse or demolition. He said that he would like to know how the property will be used if the building is demolished.

Staff explained the current zoning for the property which consists of seven lots totaling 39,023 square feet, or 0.9 acre. The lots are in three different zones. Two lots front Beall Avenue and are zoned O-2 (transitional office). The church and the lot immediately behind it are in the R-60 (single-family residential) zone. The parsonage and the two adjacent lots to the east are in the TCO-1 zone.

The City-wide Master Plan recommended rezoning the seven adjoining lots that are owned by the Church to the O-2 zone. However, after the Master Plan was adopted, the O-2 zone was amended so that adjoining lots in the O-2 zone cannot be assembled and redeveloped as one. This change would limit the ability of the Church to expand its facilities in the future if the property was entirely in the O-2 zone. While other properties were rezoned as part of the map amendment process initiated by the Master Plan, rezoning of this property was deferred until optimal zoning can be determined. It is possible to rezone the church property to allow greater flexibility for future development and expansion while retaining the historic structures. An analysis of optimal zoning would need to be done, preferably once the church determines its expansion needs. Planner Kebba explained that Jim Wasilak, Chief of Long-Range Planning would be available to respond to zoning questions.

Planner Kebba noted that the Church and parsonage buildings are also in the West Montgomery Avenue Historic District (HD overlay zone) and part of the West Montgomery Avenue National Register Historic District. Therefore, the HDC has approval authority over new construction that may be proposed on the site should the structure be removed. The HDC has the authority to determine appropriate footprint, height, massing, materials and design of new construction in the historic districts within the parameters of the underlying zoning. On the other hand, historic designation does not preclude any use or appropriate additions or modifications to existing historic structures and county, state and federal tax credits are available to help defray rehabilitation costs.

Staff read the applicable sections of State Law Article 66 (B) 8.09 & 8.10– Zoning and Planning, State Historic Area Zoning Legislation that relate to this application for demolition which requires the HDC to attempt to work with the owner to formulate an economically feasible plan for preservation, or reject the application if no plan can be established. The Commission may have 90 days after a finding of no economic plan to negotiate with others to preserve the building. The Commission may approve demolition if the building is impeding a major improvement program of significant benefit to a majority of the municipality, retention would cause undue hardship to the owner, or retention of the structure is not in the best interest of a majority of the community.

Planner Kebba said that "a major improvement program which will be of substantial benefit to the county or municipal corporation" is generally interpreted to be public facilities such as roads, bridges, schools, etc. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project is needed in these cases and a demolition permit for a structurally sound or repairable historically designated building is generally not issued until replacement plans are approved by the commission and other reviewing agencies.

Referring to "undue financial hardship" Planner Kebba cited criteria that were established by the United States Supreme Court decision in *Penn Central Transportation Co. v. New York*. This decision is still considered to be the legal standard when considering if retention of a building is, in effect, a "taking" by the local government. In general, it is proper for the HDC to consider whether a structure can be put to a reasonable beneficial use if an application for demolition is denied. It is also proper for the HDC to consider whether a reasonable return can be attained in the use of an income producing building if an application for demolition is denied. Failure to attain maximum potential profit or use is not considered to be either a "taking" or a "hardship".

With regard to the statement that "retention would not be to the best interests of a majority of persons in the community." Planner Kebba said that this standard is not precisely defined in the State Code, but is generally considered to be present if the structure poses an "imminent threat" to health or safety of the public. Lack of maintenance that produces unsafe conditions, which can be remedied, is not considered an "imminent threat."

Planner Kebba said that certain information was requested from the applicant, most of it financial, and had not yet been received by staff but would be helpful to the HDC in making a decision.

Planner Kebba stated that staff had conducted very preliminary research on alternatives to demolishing the parsonage and said that options do exist and should be further explored. These options include rehabilitating the parsonage structure and incorporating it into an overall expansion plan for the Church and analyzing zoning options that would assist in this goal; leasing the parsonage property to another user; and selling the three lots east of the Church that are currently zoned TCO-1 for small office use and using the proceeds to finance the Church's expansion effort.

Planner Kebba concluded by recommending that the HDC deny application HDC2003-00284 to demolish the former parsonage at 17 Wood Lane as Staff finds that the applicant does not meet the provisions for demolition approval as described in Sections 8.09 and 8.10 of Article 66(B) Zoning and Planning, State Historic Area Zoning Legislation. Specifically,

1. The structure is not a deterrent to a major improvement program which will be of substantial benefit to the county or municipal corporation;
2. Retention of the structure would not cause undue hardship to the owner as the applicant has not proven that the building can not be put to beneficial use; and
3. It has not been shown that retention of the building would not be to the best interests of a majority of persons in the community.

She noted that if the application for demolition is denied, the applicant may not submit the same or substantially the same application for a period of one year. As an alternative to denial, she said that the HDC may choose to further defer the decision on this application if it determines that the applicant is willing and able to supply additional information that could have a material impact on the decision.

Staff recommends that the City, HDC and staff continue to work with the applicant/property owner to find a viable solution to rehabilitate the structure and bring it back to use and that steps be taken immediately to stabilize the structure and prevent further deterioration if the application is not approved.

The HDC Chair opened the discussion up to other speakers. Reverend Jane Wood, pastor of Jerusalem Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church spoke first. She referred to the third paragraph of page 2 of the staff report and stated that the building at 17 Wood Lane stopped being used as a parsonage in 1983. The staff report indicated that it was used for this purpose until the 1990s. Reverend Wood said that a new parsonage was built in 1986 in Olney and that the parsonage adjacent to the church was not considered to be up to standards for a pastor to live in by 1983. She also said that other letters in support of demolition had been sent to the HDC that were not referred to by staff or entered into the record. Planner Kebba responded that staff would search for the missing letters and would inform the applicant of the results. These letters and additional letters received after the February 19th meeting while the record was held open will be noted in the staff report for the March 18th meeting and posted on the City's website.]

Reverend Wood entered a letter from Essex Construction, Oxon Hill, Maryland into the record. In the letter Robert Blunt, P.E. identifies himself as an engineer who has been in the building construction business for more than 30 years. He states that he examined the interior and exterior of the parsonage building and concluded that it cannot be restored using its present wood framing or its interior and exterior finish materials. Its restoration would be an appropriate consideration if it had a masonry front. Mr. Blunt recommended that the building be entirely demolished because of the severe damage caused by fire and water and the building is uninhabitable and poses a safety hazard. He concluded in his letter that his company has no interest in responding to a request for a proposal to restore any part of the building.

Reverend Wood stated that retaining the 1,200 square foot building would cause undue financial hardship to the church. She stated that the building has an actual cash value, prior to the fire and when the insurance was renewed, of \$107,696. She said that the insurance company deemed the building a total loss as the damage was assessed at \$111,923. Oak Grove Restoration submitted a verbal quote of \$192,500 to replicate the building, which exceeds its assessed value. Reverend Wood stated that the church wants to use the \$22,000 in funds being held back by the insurance company to improve the church, not to fix the parsonage. She said that the church needs classrooms, meeting rooms and handicap accessibility and this building, even restored, could not provide those things. She said that Oak Grove Restoration is the only company they have found that is willing to take on this project (to replicate the building, not rehabilitate). The Church is unwilling to sell the property and the Church feels that it is to the greater public good to have it demolished.

Reverend Wood submitted two petitions to the record: one with the names of 132 community members in support of demolition of the building at 17 Wood Lane; and one with the names of 133 members of Jerusalem-Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church also in support of 100% demolition of the building. Commissioner Moloney said that he understood that the Church would rather not sell part of the property, but he asked if the Church has looked into leasing the building. Reverend Wood replied that the Church would need approval of the Bishop to sell any portion of their property and leasing is not a viable option because they are already tightly squeezed for parking. Leasing any portion of what they have would further impede them.

Reverend Wood referred to an appraisal of the entire property from May 9, 2003, which valued it at \$960,000, but she said that this figure did not include the parsonage building as it was gutted, requires extensive renovations and deemed uninhabitable. She said that upgrading the rest of the Church can not happen with the parsonage building there.

Commissioner Moloney asked if the Church had considered incorporating the building into their expansion plans and asked about the \$5,000 reimbursement grant that the Church was awarded. Reverend Wood replied that she had not come on board until July 1, 2003 and that the grant was applied for and awarded before her tenure.

The next speaker, Sheldon Higgins, 371 N. Van Buren Street, said that he did not question anything in the staff report regarding the background or the zoning, but he disagreed with the statement in the staff recommendation that "it has not been shown that retention of the building would not be to the best interests of a majority of persons in the community."

Reverend C. Glen Taylor of Jerusalem Baptist Church in Poolesville, Maryland, stated that the Church must be made handicap accessible and it takes money to make improvements. He asked the HDC to help Reverend Wood and the congregation and continue the process until a viable resolution can be arrived at.

West End Civic Association Board member Patricia Woodward said that she resides in the West End near the Church. She said that Reverend Wood and others had attended the WECA meeting in January 2004 and asked the Board to consider their plight. She said that the Board wrote a letter stating a unanimous vote in favor of demolition. Commissioner Moloney asked how that decision was made. Ms. Woodward responded that demolition of the building makes good fundamental sense and would enable creation of something that would be more accessible to the total community.

Reverend R. Kay Barger, pastor at Rockville United Methodist Church, 112 West Montgomery Avenue, stated that she was representing more than 120 members of her Church who support demolition. She stated that, with a historical bond that goes back to the early 1800s, Rockville United Methodist Church is the sister church of Jerusalem-Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church. She said that Rockville United Methodist deals with some of the same problems, particularly with parking issues and having space for outreach programs. She said that Rockville United Methodist Church owns two houses that are used by Community Ministries of Rockville and Jefferson House, a halfway house for men. They provide these services at a rental cost of only \$1 per year in addition to some escrow funds. The two churches are integrally connected to the community and to each other by the ministries that they each provide. She said that concern for the preservation of buildings should be subjugated to the concern for people. She said that the building is an eyesore and is rat-infested. It is impeding Jerusalem-Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church's ability to expand its ministry. It is important for them to invest in their future. She said that municipalities need community churches and organizations that provide the services they provide. She said that it is in the best interest of the community to demolish the former parsonage so that the Church can expand and continue its work.

Commissioner Moloney asked Reverend Barger if the two houses that the Rockville United Methodist Church owns are in a historic district, if they are handicap accessible, and if they were adapted to their current use. She said they negotiated with the City to make it work. He asked how preservation and adaptive reuse affect the church's ministry. She said if the building is too small and they need more parking, those issues limit their ability to do good works. Reverend Barger noted that the parsonage

building on Wood Lane can only accommodate a maximum of 17 people because it is only 1,200 square feet in area. The church wants to help approximately 200 people in a larger structure.

Dianne Jones, Jerusalem Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church member, said that “unusual importance” has to do with people more than with buildings. She said that the Church’s ability to grow is severely inhibited by the Cordelia House. She said she believes that all of the Church property will be necessary to accommodate the Church’s needs. She noted that there is new construction within historic districts in Rockville and other ministries are expanding in the City. She said the Church is being held back and she cannot help but feel that this Church is not being treated the same as others.

Commissioner Moloney pointed out that new construction in the historic districts has not entailed the demolition of any historic resources as is proposed here. He added that he had provided his architectural design expertise to the church several years ago free of charge to design handicap accessibility and to bring the church up to current codes. He said none of these proposals were followed up on by the Church.

Reverend Wood said that she understood that Commissioner Moloney had brainstormed some ideas with Church members but that she was told that no plans were submitted to the church. Commissioner Moloney responded that he had given them to the pastor at the time. He will look through his files to see if he has copies.

Sheldon Higgins said that he understood that the ice house at Chestnut Lodge is being considered for demolition. Commissioner Moloney said that the developer has unofficially stated that he wants to demolish that structure but that no application to that effect had been received by the HDC.

Alwyn Taylor, 30 Hidden Field Drive in Gaithersburg, said that he is a member of the congregation. He said that the issue is what is at stake for the Church. In order to generate funds to rehabilitate the building, enthusiasm is needed on the part of the membership. There is no enthusiasm because rehabilitation is not something that would project them into the future. The Church needs to attract more members to the community and a place to provide services. Renovation only takes the Church backward 10 years. The building was designed for a family and it is not useful to try to adapt it for use for church and community services. He said that there is much enthusiasm for growing and for making the Church more accessible. The Church’s survivability at this location is at stake. The Church and all of its historical ties could be forced out of this location if it is restricted in its ability to expand.

Commissioner Broadhurst said that much more money is needed to complete the entire program envisioned by the Church. He asked if anyone had looked at design options incorporating this building and whether or not the design talent had been exhausted yet in examining this possibility. Reverend Wood questioned why the Church needed to look further when Essex Construction had already recommended demolition. She said the only reason this building is considered historic is because it is more than 50 years old.

Commissioner Broadhurst said that it is important to grow from the past but recognize that the past is also important. Commissioner Moloney added that research by the National Trust for Historic Preservation has shown that property values tend to increase faster in historic districts than in other areas.

Reverend Wood stated that the Church paid for a survey in 2003. She added that the Church has not researched grants that may be available for rehabilitation and does not plan to because such help will not solve their problems. In response to a question from staff, Reverend Wood stated that the Church has received between \$80,000 and \$90,000 from insurance from the fire damage.

Ruth Brown, 327 Lincoln Avenue, stated that she is a member of the Church and had worked at Cordelia House when the women's shelter was there. She said she was upset because her uncle's house and the store near Mt. Calvary Church had been torn down. The house was torn down during the night and without permission. Commissioner Hartranft responded that Ms. Brown had made a compelling argument for historic preservation. She said that the HDC had voted unanimously in favor of recommending the store for historic designation but the Mayor and Council had chosen not to move forward on it.

William "Billy" Gordon said that he had grown up in Rockville and had walked up the stairs of Jerusalem-Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church for the first time in 1953. He said he continues to benefit from this magnificent institution. He said he probably would not have supported demolition of the former parsonage if it had not been so damaged by arson. He read a letter from members of the Pride of Montgomery Elks Lodge, of which he is a member. The letter was in support of demolition and said that the 160-year old church needs ability to expand and grow. Mr. Borden added that most of the Lodge members had also grown up in Rockville.

James Baker said that he lives off Norbeck Road now but he was born and raised in Rockville. He said that the church will not be able to help people who are in need if the church cannot grow. He said that if all of the past ministers of the church who are now deceased came back, they would say to knock the building down.

Commissioner Moloney said he felt there was a breakdown occurring in the communication. He said the HDC needed to have the facts on the costs associated with the building. So far, he said only two assessments from two engineers had been provided by the applicant. One was five years old with a nominal estimate for structural rehabilitation and the other stated that the building was not worth rehabilitating. He noted that, according to testimony, one reputable contractor had given a cost to replicate the building, i.e. build a new structure to be identical to the parsonage building. He said replication is not the same as rehabilitating an existing structure and this contractor did not address rehabilitation or adaptive reuse. He stated that this would be the pertinent information needed by the HDC. Commissioner Moloney said that a strong case had not been made for a new replacement building that would do something that the existing building could not do if it were rehabilitated.

Reverend Wood responded that loans are available for new construction but most banks are not willing to provide loans for renovating a structure that had been deemed a total loss by the insurance company.

Robin Prather, 223 Frederick Avenue in Lincoln Park, spoke in favor of demolition.

The HDC noted that it had not yet had a chance to review letters and other information submitted to the record. Reverend Barger, pastor of Rockville United Methodist Church, asked if reviewing additional information and letters that the HDC had not yet seen would make any difference to the HDC decision on this application. She said the HDC owed it to the people to make a decision tonight.

MOTION: Commissioner Moloney moved, seconded by Commissioner Broadhurst, to keep the record open on application HDC2003-00284 to receive and review information and testimony until the end of business on March 11, 2004.

VOTE: 4-0

RECESS: The Commission was recessed at 10:35 p.m. and reconvened at 10:45 p.m.

A. HDC2003-00274	Applicant:	Todd Hickman, General Manager, NV Homes
HDC2003-00275	Address:	522 West Montgomery Avenue (Thirty Oaks)
HDC2003-00276	Request:	Presenting revised new home designs

Planner Ziek stated that the applicant had met with the HDC in December 2003 to present designs for the three houses that will be in the West Montgomery Avenue Historic District. They have made the requested changes and were here to present them to the HDC for approval. She showed views of the property from different angles and adjacent properties. She also showed the earlier and new versions of the designs and went through the list of changes from the December meeting, including making the front doors different on each house, making the garages less significant elements, simplifying dormers, changing side elevation rooflines, removing transoms over windows, simplifying the bathroom window, and using smooth Hardiplank siding.

Commissioner Hartranft noted that lighting should be accurately shown on the drawings and should be appropriate to the particular style of each house. Mr. Hickman responded that they will work with their lighting designer to accomplish this. Scott Parker, CPDS Planner, added that he will be checking that all required changes are shown when the drawings come in for building permits.

Mr. Hickman passed around samples of Tendura and Timbertrex flooring.

Commissioner Broadhurst said that he was pleased to see the revisions. He did suggest window sills on house styles A and C that have siding rather than brick.

Commissioner Moloney noted that the windows on the garages were smaller in the revisions but were perhaps now too small. Commissioner Broadhurst thought the proportion was generally satisfactory, but agreed that a slightly larger size would be more compatible. Commissioner Moloney said that, in eliminating the transoms, the windows appeared to be shorter and he asked if the window heads heights lined up on all facades. He also asked if there would be windows in the garage doors. Mr. Hickman replied that the window heads line up, and they will offer one row of windows one panel down from the top, but probably without any decorative insert. He also noted that the single garage door is easier for homeowners, considering the size of today's vehicles, and the garage locations. Commissioner Moloney said he preferred that the glass be on the top panel or that there be no glass.

Commissioner Broadhurst asked that the window trim use a sill rather than the "picture frame" treatment.

Commissioner Moloney noted that the trim around the garage door should be the same width as the rest of the trim. He also asked that the design for Model B be modified to use the keystones over the windows on the front elevation only, with soldier course on the other three facades. Similarly, he

asked to have shutters only on the front façade, and not on the other three facades. With regard to the wrap-around porches on Models B & C, he asked whether there would be additional steps by the driveway to lead directly to the porch. Mr. Hickman noted that they would be installed if the owner so wished, and they would match the front steps in design.

Commissioner Broadhurst asked if the brick opening headers shouldn't be "jack arches", and Commissioner Moloney said that the soldier courses were simpler. Commissioner Broadhurst also noted that the porch roof seams on Model B appeared to be spaced too wide, and the seams should typically be 16-20" apart. He also asked why there was a preference for the Timbertrex for the porch flooring, and Mr. Hickman replied that the Tendura has to be stained and painted, while the Timbertrex comes with integral color and is considered maintenance-free.

Commissioner Moloney asked whether the windows were true-divided light, and Mr. Hickman noted that they have the mullions inside the glass sandwich. He noted that he had showed a window sample at the December meeting, and there was no opposition. It would be very difficult for NV Homes to use a different window manufacturer because of their operations, and they need to stay with the window which was displayed at the December meeting.

Commissioner Broadhurst noted that the applicant has been accommodating and has made many changes already to improve the design of the homes to be compatible with the historic district.

Planner Ziek noted that this doesn't set precedence for rehabilitation of historic buildings as this is a new house, and they will be using all new materials.

MOTION: Commissioner Moloney moved approval of applications HDC2003-00274 through HDC2003-00275 and HDC2003-0076 with the following conditions:

1. The windows in the garage shall be changed to 2-6 x 5-2 windows;
2. The siding shall be smooth Hardiplank siding;
3. The garage doors shall have trim to match the wider trim of the windows on Models A & C;
4. All windows will include a bonded grill;
5. Lighting to be approved by staff.

The Motion was seconded by Commissioner Broadhurst.

Discussion: Commissioner Moloney noted that the HDC has never allowed the type of window grill described by the applicant within a historic district, even new construction, and this was an important detail. Commissioner Broadhurst noted that they do allow exterior storm windows and these serve to put glass over the window muntins. This breaks the reflection, and might be considered very similar to the applicant's proposal.

VOTE: 1-3; Motion failed, with Commissioner Moloney voting in favor.

MOTION: Commissioner Hartranft moved approval with the same conditions as above, save for the deletion of item #4, and to approve windows as submitted. Commissioner Broadhurst seconded.

VOTE: 3-1: Motion passed, with Commissioner Moloney dissenting.

B. HDC2003-00282

Applicant: John Bell
Address: 101 W. Jefferson Street
Request: Presenting revised new rear entrance

Planner Kebba summarized the applicant's presentation at the January 15, 2004 meeting. At the January 15th meeting, the HDC approved the window restoration portion of the applicant's proposal. They requested revisions to the proposed design of the new entry porch and also asked that the applicant include a proposal to make the church handicapped accessible.

Steve Beck, representing owner John Bell, presented two alternative designs to respond to the HDC request from the January meeting. One design provided a lower-pitched front gable roof, while the second design provided an essentially flat roofed alternative. In addition, he presented two alternatives for handicapped accessibility. One would include a long ramp leading along the parking lot to the right side of the entry porch. The other alternative involved a lift that would be built into the right hand side of the entry porch, and was mostly screened from view with stonework. The ramp is more costly (\$11,000) than the lift, and they preferred to go with the lift. Steve Beck also stated that applicant still preferred the original submittal.

Commissioner Broadhurst said that the reduced roof slope and deletion of the gable window was a better design because it presented a more respectful transition between the old church and the 1950s addition. He also said that the lift was fine. He noted that the signage looked out of place, however, being partly under roof and behind a column of the new entry. Steve Beck noted that the signage is existing and they hadn't considered moving it. They will consider relocating the signage, but want to focus on the proposed addition at this time. Commissioner Broadhurst said that the new addition will not be so prominent a focus with the reduced height.

Commissioner Moloney agreed with the 6/12 roof pitch, and also agreed that the lift would be fine.

MOTION: Commissioner Hartranft moved, seconded by Commissioner Broadhurst, to approve HDC2003-00282 for alteration of the rear entry at 101 west Jefferson Street for the gable roof with the 6:12 pitch and lift, with the condition that the signage be moved so that it is not obstructed once the entry modification is completed.

VOTE: 4-0

III. RECOMMENDATION TO PLANNING COMMISSION ON ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNS OF 8 NEW HOMES OUTSIDE OF HISTORIC DISTRICT AT THIRTY OAKS SITE

Planner Ziek presented the application with views of the property and of the proposed scheme. At the September 2003 meeting, the applicant was asked by the HDC to reduce the number of design options to add coherence to the development. The applicant therefore offered two basic models, which can be differentiated in a number of details, in porch design, in color scheme, in roof shape, etc. The developers have stated that they work with a formula so that no two adjacent or confronting houses will be the same. She also noted that the garages were set well back from the street at 16' and 24', depending on the site. Planner Scott Parker noted that this appeared to be meeting the intent of the

Mayor & Council to have a variety of homes. This item will be presented to the Planning Commission on March 10th.

Mr. Hickman was available for questions. Commissioner Moloney wondered if all the garages had to be on the same side, and Mr. Hickman noted that this minimized the impact of the garages to incoming traffic. The only modification was to the house on Lot #8, which is being commissioned for a family member by the owner of the adjacent lot (#7 or 9). Lot #8 is at the end of the street, and the garage will be on the left side instead of the right. John Clark of Elm Street Development also noted that this will provide some relief from the headlights of incoming cars. They will also have asphalt driveways and concrete sidewalks.

Commissioner Broadhurst commented that the double garage doors, instead of a single door, helps with the scale.

Mr. Hickman noted that the entrance feature will be brought before the HDC at a future meeting. Planner Parker summarized the generally favorable HDC comments with the following specific comments: For Lot 8, garage should be on the left. For Lot 12, the roof massing for the side garage should be a more traditional gable form if sold with the bonus room.

IV. APPLICATIONS FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY TAX CREDIT

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| A. HDC04-00285 | Applicant: Andrew and Sandra Sonner
Address: 205 W. Montgomery Avenue
Request: Tax credit eligibility determination |
| B. HDC04-00287 | Applicant: Alexander and Jayne Greene
Address: 11 Laird Street
Request: Tax credit eligibility determination |

Planner Kebba said she had made all the adjustments regarding interior and exterior work. These applications were complete, had been reviewed by staff, were found to meet Montgomery County's criteria for eligibility, and are recommended for approval.

MOTION: Commissioner Hartranft moved, seconded by Commissioner Broadhurst, to approve the two applications submitted for tax credit review and to have them forwarded to the County for disbursement.

VOTE: 4-0 Approved.

V. DISCUSSION / UPDATES

A. Update on designations in progress:

1. 419 Reading Avenue, Adopted 2/9/04
2. Chestnut Lodge Community/Activities Center, M&C declined for file for map amendment

B. Planning Activities and Projects:

1. Chestnut Lodge/Rose Hill design guidelines progress update: Cindy Kebba – scheduled for M&C 2/17/04
2. Rockville Cemetery design guidelines progress update: draft submitted to Cemetery Board; meeting 2/10/04
3. Lincoln Park Historic Designation: The HDC discussed Postcard Notification, and also using newspapers and local news, etc.
4. Plaques in progress: Historic site plaques, Dawson Farm, Haiti Cemetery, Hurley-Carter Farmhouse, Wootton's Mill Historic Sites (drafts to be reviewed)

VI. COMMITTEE / ORGANIZATION REPORTS

A. Comments – Historic District Commissioners: The HDC requested staff to work up a write-up on buildings that are less than 50 years old and requested a copy of the National Park Service article about such structures.

Commissioner Hartranft said the HDC is in urgent need of a worksession with the Mayor and Council, hopefully before 6 months pass. Historic reviews are not going to get easier as more buildings significant to the recent past come forward. Commissioner Hartranft also commented that she was concerned about the “timing” issue, noting that the Activities Building at Chestnut Lodge was perceived to be reviewed at the last minute. She said the HDC needs to be pro-active. She also asked where the HDC and staff are on the Recent Past Survey as a thorough and professional survey would make everyone's life easier. Commissioner Hartranft also commented that the Mayor and Council dismissed the HDC recommendation prior to a public hearing. She feels that the HDC should have sent a representative, and that in the future, the HDC should always send at least one commissioner to represent their recommendation.

Staff Kebba noted they were working on the Lincoln Park and East Rockville surveys now, in terms of staff time scheduling. Commissioner Hartranft asked whether staff could do an estimate on a recent-past survey, in terms of cost and schedule.

B. Lincoln Park Historical Society - Anita Neal Powell: Anita distributed a flyer on mail about the bus tour LPHS has organized for February 28. She noted that the Second Annual African American Preservation Conference will be held in the Hilton Hotel in Silver Spring May 29-31.

C. Peerless Rockville - Peerless Rockville sent over its nomination form for 2004 Awards, for HDC consideration and input.

VI. ADJOURN

The HDC adjourned at 11:15 p.m.